

Land policy REVIEW

Vol. I

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1938

No. 4

An Experiment in Democratic Policy-Making

by RAINER SCHICKELE

IN the fall of 1937 the Governor of the State of Iowa appointed a committee of 45 members to study the farm tenure situation in Iowa and to formulate recommendations for its improvement. The committee was set up as a special committee of the Iowa State Planning Board. The membership of the Iowa Farm Tenancy Committee was chosen to represent various interests not only with respect to the tenancy problem alone, but also with respect to the general welfare of the rural farm economy. It was strictly nonpartisan and representative in character. Fred K. Hawley, who had served on the Nation-wide President's Committee on Farm Tenancy the year before, was entrusted with the chairmanship of the committee.

At the first session, this committee arrived at a momentous decision. Since much statistical information regarding the tenure situation in Iowa had been collected by the college and the Land Use Planning office of the

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the main question to which the committee needed an answer was: How do the people of Iowa appraise the tenure problem, and what in their opinion can be done about it? Instead of concocting a program around the conference table, the committee agreed to bring the question before the people, and to give them the fullest possible opportunity to express their opinions and wishes as to the most desirable policy of tenure reform in Iowa. The committee declared itself ready to abide by the verdict of the people and to base its report upon the majority views regarding the fundamental issues involved.

Twenty-five members of the committee volunteered to arrange for public hearings in a number of counties assigned to them. They appointed in each county a local committee of three to five farmers who assumed responsibility for arranging and publicizing the county hearing. No effort was spared to see that these hearings did not become identified with any particular farm organization or group. The tenancy committee as a sponsor urgently appealed to everyone, regardless of organization, political affiliation or tenure status, to attend and to express his views. Members of the county agricultural planning committees, the county agricultural conservation committees and local farm organizations, the county agents and the editors of local newspapers, all cooperated to bring out a large attendance and to safeguard complete freedom of expression. One hundred public hearings were held in the 99 counties of the State during the months of January, February, and March 1938. Conservative estimates indicate that more than 8,000 people attended these hearings. At each hearing a member of the State committee emphasized the committee's desire to gather the opinions and suggestions of the people regarding the tenure problem. Many of these hearings started in a tense atmosphere of suspicion and skeptical watchfulness, but almost invariably the reserve broke down and lively and constructive discussion followed.

Blowing Off Steam and Getting Facts

Many challenging problems are involved in such a venture. On the one hand, it is essential that freedom of discussion on the part of the people should not be muzzled. On the other hand, it is equally essential that the discussion be kept within the scope of the committee's task and be given guidance to facilitate the crystallization of constructive suggestions. Moreover, it is obvious that many a tenant might hesitate to express himself freely in the presence of his landlord, and vice versa. The committee attempted—and I believe highly successfully—to meet those problems in a rather unique way. During the forenoon each hearing was devoted to a general airing of two questions: (1) What is wrong with our tenure system? and (2) What can be done about it? Outside of a time restriction of 3 to 5 minutes, no limitations regarding subject or issues were placed on those attending the hearing. Everyone was given opportunity to "blow off steam," to accuse or defend our existing economic order, to com-

DEC 24 '38

plain or brag about individual experiences, to launch utopian plans, or to make sarcastic criticisms.

The afternoon of the hearing was given over to a more specific discussion of a short questionnaire with which everyone in attendance was provided. This questionnaire had been carefully prepared by the committee and included nine fundamental questions regarding basic problems of land tenancy and ownership. Everyone was urged to indicate on the questionnaire his frank answers to these questions, and to jot down any modifications or suggestions. This method enabled each tenant and landlord to express his opinions freely regarding the specific issues involved without fear of hurting the feelings of his partner or his friends.

At the end of the hearing, questionnaires that contained more than 40 questions requesting specific suggestions, observations, and criticisms, were handed out with a strong appeal that they be taken home and studied and filled out at leisure and mailed to the tenancy committee.

By the middle of April the committee had received from all over the State more than 4,000 questionnaires, briefs, and letters which contained a tremendous wealth of experiences, observations, and ideas.

County Planning Committees Help

The Extension Service and the Land Use Planning office provided the agricultural planning committees with discussion outlines, statistical material, and other information on the farm tenure problem.

In a number of cases these planning committees delegated one of their members to present their views at the public hearing in his particular county. About three-fourths of all the county agricultural planning committees in the State prepared a well-balanced and detailed report on the tenure situation, which proved valuable to the tenancy committee in formulating its recommendations.

To the State Planning Board and the Land Use Planning office was assigned the task of summarizing and integrating the mass of information gathered by the Iowa Farm Tenancy Committee. It was simple to tabulate the answers to questions that had been checked "yes," "no," or "undecided," but the summarization and condensation of the innumerable suggestions, observations, and criticisms that were written into the schedules or were contained in the many letters, briefs, and statements or in the records of the county hearings proper, presented great difficulties. Yet, as these comments contained exceedingly relevant reflections of public opinion and many constructive criticisms and suggestions, the effort necessary to condense this material and whip it into usable form was fully justified. This "Summary of Findings," a volume of almost 250 mimeographed pages, was sent to members of the Iowa Farm Tenancy Committee for intensive study. The small steering committee prepared a brief, tentative statement of the general trend of public opinion regarding desirable tenure reforms and called a general committee meeting early in

May. This meeting was combined with a last State-wide public hearing on the tenure problem before the entire committee at which representatives of insurance companies, farm organizations, and other interested persons were specifically invited to appear. A drafting committee was designated to formulate a report and recommendations and to submit a tentative draft to the general committee.

The Debate As to Recommendations

The drafting committee held a number of highly animated sessions, drawing up a skeleton outline of the report and gradually filling out this skeleton by correspondence and consultation. The Land Use Planning office acted as a clearing house during formulation of the report, and after a month of active work the report was presented in June to the general committee. This last session of the Iowa Farm Tenancy Committee truly constituted the climax of its work. Section by section the report was discussed and debated, several members taking strong exception to some portions. After a long, spirited, and at times dramatic debate, several amendments to the report were made and the committee adopted the whole report unanimously. However, a number of members reserved the right to file commentaries stating their reservations regarding specific sections of the report, and it was agreed that these commentaries would be published as part of the final report. The Iowa State Planning Board, which is strictly a fact-finding agency and does not sponsor any kind of legislation, transmitted the report of the Iowa Farm Tenancy Committee to the Governor and the general assembly without committing itself to the recommendations contained in the report.

The report consists of three parts: First, the present state of affairs, gravity of the tenure problem in Iowa, various causes of the rise in tenancy and its unfavorable effects upon the land and the development of the rural community, are described.

A Statement of Guiding Principles

The second part contains an outline of a long-time policy of farm tenure improvement. It is a declaration of basic principles which the people of Iowa believe are essential for the development of a stable and prosperous farm life. On the level of Federal policies, stabilization of prices, more adequate agricultural credit facilities, and Federal assistance in promoting farm home ownership are recommended. On the State level, the recommendations fall into three categories: (1) Measures to encourage home ownership, (2) measures to improve landlord-tenant relationships, and (3) recommendations concerning problems indirectly connected with tenure conditions. All of these recommendations are intended not for direct legislative enactment, but as guiding principles in the development of tenure policies over several decades. They indicate the general direction which the Iowa citizenry wants to follow.

The third part of the report contains specific recommendations for early legislative enactment. The measures to encourage farm home ownership include a tax on capital gains from sales of land, protection of farm operators' tenure in years of crop failure or depression, and revision of foreclosure procedure and abolition of deficiency judgments. As to landlord-tenant relationships, the recommendations call for automatic continuation of year-to-year leases and a minimum period of notice for termination; compensation for unexhausted improvements the tenant has made; arbitration provisions to facilitate a fair and expeditious settlement of differences between landlord and tenant; and the limitation of the landlord's lien to not more than one-half the value of the farm produce of the current year.

There is, of course, room for criticism of any of the sections of the report. The very breadth of its scope inevitably implies vagueness and lack of detail. Its strength does not lie in formulation of specific statutory provisions but in statement of the general philosophy which should permeate any policy enacted to solve the tenure problem. As one member of the committee said, "The report manifests the deep longing of the farm people for more stable and equitable tenure conditions, for security in their occupancy of the land, and for ample opportunities in the economic and cultural development of farm life."

Census Indicates Back-to-the-Farm Movement Continues Undiminished

FAR from dwindling in the past 5 years, the return of parts of the population to farms continues without check, preliminary surveys for the 1940 agricultural census indicate. One in nine of the 3,000 farms enumerated reported persons who had not resided on a farm 5 years before. The average number of persons for each enumeration year was 3. The proportion of this migration—reflected from surveys in selected counties in 40 States—is about the same as for the selected counties shown by the farm census 3 years previous.

In another survey it was indicated that nonfarm income is a substantial factor in total rural income. For the 975 farmers who reported nonfarm income, \$558,522, or \$573 per farm, was reported. About a fourth of the farmers with nonfarm income received less than \$100, and another fourth from \$100 to \$300.

The level of living on farms has risen distinctly since 1930, still another survey suggested. The inference was drawn from the reported increases in proportions of farm dwellings having electricity, bathtubs, radios, and other conveniences. Gains also were shown in the farm machinery, trucks, and automobiles on farms. This survey, however, reflected great disparities between different parts of the country and between different farm income groups.

Farm Management Aspects of Land Planning

by SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

FARM management is primarily concerned with the internal economy of a farm or ranch, and with interrelations between that economy and agricultural policy and programs. The questions pertaining to the use of land by farmers as parts of their operating units, farms or ranches, are important on all land used for agricultural production. When the suitability of certain lands for agricultural uses is questioned, the decision must rest on whether farm units in the area can be organized in a way that will permit farmers to obtain a reasonably satisfactory living (both from their own and society's viewpoint) to maintain the farm plant, and to support the public and private institutions which they require in order to continue living in the area. In other words, a farm management income test of submarginality for specific uses is a part of the decision even in questions regarding the alternative major uses of land.

By far the most important farm management contribution to land planning will be made in the supermarginal areas—on lands that will continue to be used for agriculture, but where, nevertheless, important adjustments are desirable both for individual operators and in the national interest, to promote conservation, or to influence supplies of agricultural products. In the broad transition zones between the areas unsuited for arable farming and the better farming areas of this country, we find some of the most perplexing land use problems. The need for a program of land use adjustment in these areas arises either from the circumstance that the potentialities of soil productivity, climatic conditions, or crop adaptation have been misjudged, or that changes in economic conditions, in production technique, or decline in soil productivity have taken place. In such areas farms and homes have been established on the basis of certain types and sizes of farms. Investments have been made in buildings for livestock and equipment to care for crops. A pattern of land operation and farm practices has been established, and farmers have developed aptitudes for the prevailing type of farming. While these areas should remain in farming uses, the correction of present misuse of land is likely to involve a shift to more extensive uses and thus to reduce the effective size of present farms, and perhaps eventually to reduce the number of farms in the area.

Circles of Influence Through Adjustment

This is the type of problem that is often faced in soil erosion areas, and in the transition zone between farming and grazing in the Great Plains. Carrying out a land use adjustment of this type will have important social

and economic repercussions, not only on the farmers of the area—both those who remain and those who move to other areas, and perhaps to other occupations—but also on the private and public institutions of the particular area as well as on those affected by changes in it.

One of the important problems, however, is to determine the sizes and types of farms that give promise of returns that will permit farmers in the area to become self-supporting on a long-term basis. A feasible plan of land use adjustment must necessarily be worked out in cooperation with individual farmers and landowners, since the success of any land use adjustment program in farming areas is obviously dependent upon its acceptance by the people who own and work the land. Farm management research and planning should be organized to bring the viewpoint of farmers to bear on proposals for adjustments in land use, and the analysis of the probable effects on operating units of the proposed changes should be carried out in cooperation with farmers.

Thus the farm management specialist contributes data and the tools for its analysis, as well as broad knowledge of national conditions. The farmers contribute the experienced judgement regarding adaptation of different proposals to the area in question. A balanced plan of adjustment should result.

The Approach Developed in Montana

The Division of Farm Management and Costs, in cooperation with Montana State College and the State land planning specialist, has developed an approach of this type for the Plains areas of Montana. Available physical and economic data have been assembled with special emphasis on analysis of income possibilities of different types and sizes of farms in relation to the physical resources of each subarea. This background analysis, which portrays past and existing situations, as well as some of the alternatives in adjustment, has furnished the basis for the work of the county planning committees. Out of the joint endeavor of specialists and farmers some definite suggestions for adjustment have been developed. But this stage does not complete the job. These suggestions will furnish the basis for discussions with the rank and file of farmers in the area and public opinion will either support or reject them. Even if they materialize into action programs for the particular area, details of the planning and the adjustment process are necessarily continuous because of constant changes in conditions. Major land use readjustments, however, are of long-term character and once commitments are made along a given line modification may be possible only in the details of development and administration.

Studies similar to the one in Montana are being pursued in South Dakota, Nevada, and Texas. Plans are also under way for similar studies in the Southeast and in some areas of the Southern Plains.

Studies of this character, conducted in sufficient detail to deal with the fundamental problems of the area, with the adjustment suggestions developed in cooperation with farmers, and checked by public opinion in the area, give promise of furnishing the basic information needed for building the programs of the public action agencies. General information regarding land use serves only a limited purpose for many action programs. For instance, the Farm Security Administration in its rehabilitation program needs to know the types and sizes of farms and the practices which are likely to prove most practical for its clients in a particular area. If studies and farmer experience indicate that farms of a given size and type cannot be made self-supporting over a period of years, the lending policy in that area could be guided in other directions.

The Place for Basic Background Studies

The Soil Conservation Service in its district program must have information, not only on the physical effects of conservation practices, but also on the probable income effects of those practices on different sizes and types of farms, as well as for the area as a whole. If, then, such studies are organized to deal with the fundamental adjustment problems of the area and are carried down to the probable effects of suggested adjustments on certain classes of farms, they can serve as basic background for the programs of the several public action agencies. Thus, considerable economy of effort is achieved.

Discussion of land use problems has generally been confined to the poorer farming areas—those of questionable value for farming and more especially the transition areas which are likely to remain in farming uses, but which, nevertheless, are facing major land use adjustment. If broadly defined to include such problems as those of serious erosion, areas of the latter type are tremendously important in the agriculture of this country; but we must not forget the important place occupied by the better farming areas—the level fertile prairies of the Midwest and the river deltas in different parts of the country. It is quite possible that changes in organization and operation of farms in such areas—through technological improvements especially—will have very decided repercussions on the areas which we now recognize as “land use problem areas.” Farm management studies in the past have probably tended to concentrate too heavily on the good farming areas, but it would probably be an even greater mistake to ignore them. This emphasizes the need for a broad attack on the farm management aspects of land planning. However, the probers must at the same time dig deeply enough to ferret out the fundamental problems. This is a task which requires for its accomplishment the cooperation of all state and Federal workers, as well as contributions from the judgment and experience of practical farmers.

Land of Mañana

by RALPH CHARLES

DESCENDANTS of the Spanish conquistadores who first established permanent settlements in New Mexico in 1598, the native Spanish-Americans of that State are controlled by the patterns of an ancient economy and by poverty. However picturesque their guitars and chili-festooned adobe houses may appear to the outsider, their lives lack many of the things we consider enviable.

They grow their own wheat and have it ground at the mill. It is not uncommon to see wheat being threshed under the trampling hooves of horses. Irrigation practices are inefficient and wasteful, and cultural practices in general are inadequate and primitive. The custom of dividing property equally among all the children at the death of a property owner has resulted in holdings that are now too cramped, in many cases, for even a meager subsistence. Their holdings frequently will not justify the type of farm organization they follow, but they conform to it almost undeviatingly because the customs have been those of their forebears for many generations.

They would be in a poor position, at all events, to adapt themselves readily to changing conditions, since comparatively few adults among them use the English language either in writing or in speech. In some of the villages the Malthusian doctrine of population appears applicable. At any rate, it is evident that the resources available to them will not support them at a standard of living ordinarily regarded as satisfactory.

Poverty is the cause of poverty, and each succeeding generation tends to become more fixed in these conditions. In an attempt more nearly to correct the undesirable conditions that exist, the Federal Government is undertaking a land utilization project in the Rio Puerco Watershed.

A Triple-Threaded Population Pattern

The Cuba-Rio-Puerco Land Purchase Project is located in a typical New Mexican area, with the complicated pattern of subsistence Spanish-Americans, subsistence Indians, subsistence Anglo homesteaders, commercial livestock operators, and itinerant users of uncontrolled range. It is situated principally in the west central part of Sandoval County in the Rio Puerco Valley, near the village of Cuba, New Mexico.

The project area contains a total acreage of 407,606 in two sites. Site 1 is a large grant of about 86,000 acres, all in one ownership, and is virtually all grazing land. Site 2, containing 325,337 acres, comprises 144,117 acres of privately owned land, 35,270 acres of corporation-owned land, and 147,520 acres of State and federally owned land. This portion of the project is badly over-grazed, ground cover is depleted, run-off is rapid, and

erosion is accelerated. Estimates of stocking vary from 200 to 500 percent of actual carrying capacity and, as a result of depleted forage, high stock-death losses were suffered last winter.

There are approximately 400 subsistence Spanish-American families occupying this stretch of the Rio Puerco Valley. Problems of the various communities differ not in kind but merely in degree. Their individual holdings of irrigable and range land are far too small to produce a satisfactory living, and failure of diversion dams with subsequent curtailment of irrigated acreages has aggravated an already acute situation.

In the past these people grazed their livestock on the surrounding open range. Through the years, however, they have seen this free range dwindle and disappear. Confirmation of the old Spanish land grants, creation of the forest reserves and Indian reservations, increasing pressure from the Navajos on the west, intrusion of a few large commercial livestock interests, homesteading by Anglos, the operation of the Taylor Grazing Act, and Government purchases of land for Indian use have practically eliminated the range for use of the subsistence type non-Indian operator.

The Problem Now and Plans for the Future

As a result of these various factors, there is a group of Spanish-American villages comprising approximately 2,000 people who are dependent largely on relief for their cash income. Their housing, sanitation, and water facilities are woefully inadequate, and their standard of living is much lower than it was a generation ago. Diseases and mental deficiency cases are prevalent. Their scanty livestock are dying from lack of forage and too frequently the people themselves suffer from lack of food.

The purpose of the Cuba-Rio Puerco Project is to alleviate this condition by making additional resources available to these subsistence operators and to make possible proper land-use practices through placing the area under unified control.

Three definite lines of action are contemplated. First, it is proposed to acquire the Antonio Sedillo grant located near the Laguna Indian Reservation and exchange it for the Ojo del Espiritu Santo grant. The latter grant, though far removed from the Laguna Reservation, is located within this project area and is being used by the Laguna tribe's sheep. Second, it is proposed to purchase the railroad-owned and certain of the privately owned lands in the Rio Puerco Valley, to place the area under controlled use, to rehabilitate the land by proper conservation practices, and to improve the condition of the native people by combining this area with the Ojo del Espiritu Santo grant and making all of the Government-owned land resources in the area available to the needy families in position to utilize them and having the greatest need for them if even the barest minimum of livelihood is to be maintained. Third, it is proposed to renovate the irrigation systems in order to permit the cultivation of a larger amount of land. The water problem is receiving some attention at the present

time, and an approved W. P. A. project promises to aid one community by replacing a diversion dam. This is inadequate, however, as the entire upper portion of the watershed should be planned and developed under the provisions of the water facilities act.

There are, of course, many difficulties involved in this program. Most important is the complex status of the federally owned lands at present. A portion of the area is public domain, administered under the Taylor Grazing Act, and an equally large area is a withdrawal of public domain made by the Indian Service pending settlement of the Navajo boundary question. This withdrawn area constitutes a grave problem since no agency has jurisdiction and as a result any livestock owner, regardless of commensurability, past use, or need, can operate in the area. As the last outpost of the itinerant stockman, this territory cannot be brought under control too soon for the benefit of the range as a whole. There is also a number of scattered Indian allotments in the project that have been a source of continual friction between Indians and non-Indians. The question of administration of the area must be agreed upon by various agencies, and a plan for resolving the conflict over Indian allotments in the area must be developed.

Pointing the Way to Local Government Changes

The next problem in importance is the effect of land purchase on local and county government. The land in Sandoval County is at present 68 percent federally owned, and any diminution of taxable value from the county assessment rolls will affect the county finances. At present, of course, more than a third of the project acreage is tax delinquent—50,000 of the 144,117 privately owned acres. Unfortunately, however, 25 percent of any reasonable fee for grazing, the amount now authorized by law to be paid to counties, based on the carrying capacity of the land, will not return as much revenue to the county as is now received from taxes. Eventually there must be some reorganization of local governmental units; and while this project will not directly bring it about, it may indirectly force the issue to the fore.

The most significant aspect of the Cuba-Rio Puerco area is its typification of much of central northern New Mexico. The Spanish-American subsistence operator cannot compete with the more aggressive Anglo and the large stockman, and the subsistence Indian has the watchful and aggressive protection of the Federal Government. It is evident that some public program must be conducted for the welfare of the subsistence Spanish-American. This project, if thorough cooperation is received from all agencies, offers an opportunity to correct the land-use maladjustments of a large area, will assist in solving the water problems, will contribute greatly to the welfare of surrounding villages, and will serve as a guide for future adjustments in similar areas in northern New Mexico.

"All the Old Mistakes"

by FRANK T. SWETT

IN a recent speech, Sir Josiah Stamp quizzically said, "Apparently some Britishers look upon economists as one of the lowest forms of animal life." In a more serious vein he added, "Only the experience accumulated and expounded by the economist and only the struggling effort to apply its lesson to the new conditions, free from wishful thinking, can keep the world from making all the old mistakes."

When we consider land-use planning we plunge into millions of perplexities, with six million farmers on six million farms, little and big, rich and poor, wet and dry, with all sorts of crops, bugs, and blights. With such infinite complexities where may we find human beings wise enough to plan better land use? Can economists be of help?

In past decades almost everybody except farmers did the planning. During the World War, the Government installed thousands of farm-advising experts to prod farmers into increased production. "Food Will Win the War" became a slogan. But the missionaries didn't quit when the war ended. The planners still wanted two blades of wheat, two tons of prunes, and two farms where one grew before. Vast drainage and irrigation projects were fostered, along with closer settlement, intensive cultivation, and conversion of grass land into dust-bowl wheat fields. The voice of the promoter was heard in the land.

Is it any wonder that ruinous crop surpluses soon became the rule? Farmers had permitted others to do what planning was done, and naturally the others lapped the cream and the farmers got skim milk. When the latter woke up they found they had "unplanned themselves" into poverty. It was not until the farmer was too poor to buy anything that factories, pressed for customers, began to realize the usefulness of the farmer as a buyer.

And, as a result of all this non-planning, it has been only in the last few years that the economist in the West has come to be recognized as a reputable and useful member of agricultural society. In 1930, Banker Gianini, by a wise and generous donation, helped establish an able corps of agricultural economists at the California College of Agriculture. In the land-use planning now being attempted on a Nation-wide scale, these economists have a role to perform in helping to keep planning on a sound basis.

A Million and a Half Acres—and Red Ink

As a striking example of non-planning, or what some would call "unsound planning," let's look at California's enormous acreage of trees and vines. Before the war-time boom there were a million acres, produc-

ing about three million tons. After a few boom years we woke up to an area of one and a half million acres, producing 4,700,000 tons. The sudden addition of 1,700,000 tons, an increase of 56 percent, threw California horticulture into a sea of red ink.

Prices fell below costs of production and resulted in the destruction by digging of tens of thousands of acres of deciduous trees and vines which had cost millions of dollars to plant. But this loss was but a drop in the bucket. With markets glutted, even the pre-war orchards lost money, and valuations of properties declined amazingly.

We must not forget the curious connection between the tragic horticultural boom and the ill-advised California irrigation boom; the two were Siamese twins. Over-development of irrigation was one of the direct causes of the over-planting of grapes, peaches, pears, oranges, and other fruits. Vice versa, the boom in fruits brought about premature development of too many expensive dams and ditches. Between 1904 and 1914 the annual increase in irrigated area had been only 20,000 acres a year. But with the dizzy boom, an average of 200,000 acres, or about 2,000,000 acres in 10 years, were added to irrigation districts.

The great delusion of "unlimited markets for fruits" arose from the brief interlude of 4 years, 1916 to 1920, when armies of all nations required dried and canned fruits and Europe was on short rations. Many an orchard or vineyard produced crops selling at from \$300 to \$1,000 an acre, insuring, in spite of high labor costs, handsome profits for growers on the better lands.

As an example of the seductive superficiality prevalent at this time, it was stated in an official publication, by a notable academic promotive enthusiast, referring to a State land-settlement project: "It is predicted that within 6 years after the first grapevine and peach tree is planted, that this project will be returning a million dollars a year to the State of California."

Alas, when those peach trees came into bearing, thousands of competitive orchards and vineyards had burst into simultaneous production. Many crops were not worth harvesting, and peach trees were being chopped into firewood. From 1930 to 1934, about 440,000 tons of peaches fell to the ground, unharvested for lack of a market. Good fruit but no buyers.

What Could Land Planning Have Done?

Could competent land-use planning have checked the frenzied boom? Could the advices of agricultural economists and a recognition of the plain facts they could have broadcast have stemmed the blind rush of optimists credulous of the enthusiastic promotions of Chambers of Commerce and land subdividers, when even the State of California became one

of the leading subdividers, promoting two glittering, but ill-fated colonies? The answer is both yes and no.

The ultra-rash optimists of both city and country would have paid little heed to economists and much heed to rainbow promoters. But many prudent men would have been glad to "stop, look, and listen." They would have heeded the facts that only impartial economists are trained to collect and analyze. The boom would not have shot so high, and would not have had so far to drop when came the inevitable collapse. Instead of the penalty of \$500,000,000, which the boom and collapse are estimated to have cost, we might have suffered less than half that amount.

If land-use planning in America, primitive in its present beginnings, perhaps faulty and imperfect, can at least save the coming generation from what Sir Josiah Stamp terms "making *all* the old mistakes," it will have more than justified its existence.

Planning, Whether "Negative" Or Not

It will be too much to expect any group of planners to survey and guarantee smooth roads to prosperity. But planning groups may do much to warn against snares and pitfalls. Call this, if you will, "negative planning." It may prove one of the most useful safeguards of land-use planning.

Land-use planners may well devote serious study, locally and nationally, to future Government plans for the distribution of the waters of the Columbia, the Sacramento, and the Colorado Rivers, which entail the fate of untold millions of dollars and of thousands of possible settlers, not only within the projects, but in competitive areas outside.

There has been a tendency in the past, in both district and Federal irrigation projects, to leave the planning and the decisions to engineers of rather single-track mathematical minds. There has been a tendency to supply indiscriminately high-cost water, not only to the good lands in a project, but equally to leachy coarse sands, or to areas where the hardpan is up to the first rail of the fence, or to porous gravels where water turns to steam in the desert sun before it drops into the barren depths below.

In spite of the heavy pressure of local promotive groups, should it not be incumbent to precede decisions as to where the water is to be put with soil surveys based on productive capacity and adaptability rather than merely technical classification, which has little relation to agricultural merit? High-cost water on poor land means bankruptcy for settlers and losses to the Government.

Tests of Soil and Settlement Alike

On all untried lands soil surveys should be one of the first steps in land-use planning. Before experimenting on a vast scale at enormous expense on untried locations, it would seem ordinary common sense to substitute

the laboratory method of approach for the old hit-or-miss superficial bureaucratic guesswork. Experimental crop testing, and limited settlement on small test areas, might save the waste of untold millions of dollars on economically unsound locations.

In addition, it would seem sensible to precede consideration of any project, whether land settlement, or change in land use, or irrigation, or drainage, by competent economic surveys. Such surveys may prevent enormous wastes of human effort and hard-earned money. Such procedure should encourage wise, and discourage unwise, land utilization.

Let us earnestly hope that the present administration, in spite of all insistent pressure groups, will require adequate economic surveys of all proposed projects. Such prudent procedure should prevent many serious economic and social wastes.

What is the ultimate goal? Slogans are often meaningless because they are not quantitative. Doubtless for years we will hear acrimonious tirades over the radio and in the press referring to those indefinite phrases "An economy of scarcity," or its reverse, "An economy of plenty." If the latter means enormous unlimited production of deficit-breeding surpluses, its "plenty" means plenty of foreclosures.

What agriculture really needs, to be specific, is a program for the greatest possible volume of foods and fibers that can be marketed at prices that will maintain solvency for the average efficient American farmer. Let's call it, "An economy of adequacy."

If land-use planning strives toward this goal, it should prove a precious national asset.



Contributors to this Issue

RAINER SCHICKELE is State land planning specialist of B. A. E. for Iowa and is a member of the staff of Iowa State College. . . . RALPH CHARLES is State land planning specialist of B. A. E. for New Mexico. . . . FRANK T. SWETT, a Californian, is chairman emeritus of the Commonwealth Club's agricultural section, managed a pear growers' association for 18 years, and is now a fruit grower. . . . L. G. SORDEN is project manager of the Wisconsin Isolated Settler Project. . . . And LYLE LINDESMITH is a member of the Amarillo land utilization staff of the Soil Conservation Service.

Applying a Plan for Land and People

by L. G. SORDEN

IN 24 counties of northern Wisconsin plans for an orderly system of land use have reached an intermediate stage, the stage between ideal planning and effectuation in practice of such a proposed program. The outgrowth of many years of work by county agents with the people themselves, the effects of these early attempts to bring land planning into close relation with the daily lives of the average rural person have a special interest. Back of the work of the county agents lay, of course, a long background of cooperative theoretical endeavor, but for the purposes of this paper, the immediate point is that partly through this medium of closest Federal-State contact with farm people themselves, a guide to better use of land is being given effect.

The rural zoning ordinances in these counties, therefore, are not to be regarded as simply the first concretions of theory into practice. They are that, but they are also the product of planning in which local people had an influence, even if such participation was not of the intimate sort that is the goal of most current land-planning campaigns. About these ordinances now is being built a rural economy drawn to definite specifications, specifications indicated as desirable for the people not only of those counties, but of the State as a whole. Part of the superstructure being erected upon these zoning ordinances was provided by the Federal land utilization program in its northern Wisconsin project. Recently, to this program has been added an additional project for the purchase of holdings of settlers who are unable to conform to the new pattern of land use that the ordinances have made mandatory for new settlers. Full effects of such a zoning program must be the fruit of many years. But the 5 years' experience of the northern Wisconsin project, in at least some of its phases, affords an interesting commentary upon planning theory and planning practice.

The Federal Government Lends a Hand

By authority of a State Enabling Act, these 24 northern Wisconsin counties have restricted, by zoning ordinances, the use of some 5 million acres of land against future agricultural development. Cooperating with this endeavor, the Department of Agriculture established the northern Wisconsin project, which, in addition to making possible purchase of the scattered holdings of settlers in these counties, is helping the settlers to relocate near community areas on a sounder social and financial basis.¹

¹ Mr. Sorden was in charge both of the land utilization and relocation phases of the project, responsible both to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Farm Security Administration.

Under the Wisconsin zoning laws, settlers already living within restricted areas may continue to use their land, but no further settlement is permitted. To date, 299 isolated settlers have availed themselves of the northern Wisconsin project's offer to buy, and have sold their lands to the Federal Government. All of the settlers whose farms were purchased were living on submarginal land. The major portion of the good soils in the area have already been settled. The vanishing timber supply which once supplied part-time income, together with the low quality of soil and isolation of tracts, has left hundreds of settlers stranded. In certain counties, as many as 80 percent of the families whose farms were purchased, received relief aid. In Forest County, for instance, 124 tracts were purchased for a total of \$99,268.22. In the 5-year period prior to May 1, 1937, this group received \$52,000 in direct relief, and \$24,537.86 from the W. P. A., or \$76,537.81. This sum approaches the amount of money spent in purchasing their submarginal farms.

The above figures do not fully indicate relief spending as there were some other members of the families who undoubtedly worked on W. P. A. Their income from that source is not indicated. Surplus commodities, which make up a considerable portion of relief aid, are not considered in the direct relief given to these families. In addition, there are other emergency funds such as those of the C. C. C., F. S. A., N. Y. A., C. W. A., F. E. R. A., N. I. R. A., P. W. A., and drought and seed relief loans that are not included in the amount of emergency relief money that this group may have received. If these other emergency incomes are added to direct relief and W. P. A. expenditures, there has undoubtedly been spent from the emergency relief appropriation for the 5-year period, an amount equal to the cost of the submarginal land purchased.

Fifty Percent From Relief To Self-Support

It is not to be assumed that all of the people whose holdings in the area were purchased are now self-supporting. Some of them are so widely scattered in the State, as well as in other parts of the United States, that it is impossible to obtain accurately the number of those still on relief. From the information available, however, it is estimated that one-half of those originally on relief are now self-supporting.

In addition to the purchase of the submarginal land, a relocation program has been carried on to assist these settlers in finding new homes. The land-buying program preceded the relocation project. About 45 percent of the settlers moved from their farms before the latter work was started. Prior to that time, however, considerable service work was given to these families in assisting them to find new locations. Somewhat less than one-half of the families whose farms are purchased were actual farmers or had a background of farming experience. Only 38 percent have relocated on farms and are now making their living from the soil. Fully one-third of the families were too old for farming, or for industrial occupa-

tions. A few have returned to industrial centers and have obtained work similar to that which they were doing before locating in northern Wisconsin.

Following is a tabulation of the present occupations of the families originally living on the submarginal land:

Farming	114
Woodwork	20
General labor—includes factory work, road work, W P. A., etc.	67
Retired—includes 11 receiving old-age and mothers' pensions	47
Resort work	7
Business—largely mercantile, but includes 2 school teachers	23
Conservation work	4
Deceased	6
Not yet moved from the land—includes those not yet paid or paid since their crops were planted	11

299

Of the 299 families living on the land at the time it was optioned, 43 have moved to other States, and the remainder have located within Wisconsin. The number going to other States is as follows: Indiana, 11; Oregon, 8; Michigan, 5; Washington, 4; Minnesota, 3; Ohio, 3; Alaska, 2 (Matanuska Colony); Illinois, 2; California, 2; Iowa, 1; Kentucky and South Dakota, 1 each.

Few Go Back Where They Came From

It is interesting to note that a surprisingly small number have returned to the locality in which they lived before moving to their submarginal farms. On one project almost one-half of the farms optioned were owned by people originally from Kentucky who had come to Wisconsin to work in the woods. At the time the land was optioned most of them indicated that they planned to return to their native State, but when they finally relocated only one returned to Kentucky.

Definite assistance was given in relocating 123 of these families. Relocation farms were provided for 25, and 18 received temporary loans from the Wisconsin Rural Rehabilitation Corporation to purchase farms or homes until such a time as the money from sale of their submarginal farms was received.

The relocation farms were located and appraised by the project staff. The prospective resettlement clients were then shown a number of these farms and chose the one most to their liking. While the project staff supervised quite closely the type and size of farm, final selection was left to the client. Money for the purchase of the farm was loaned directly by the Farm Security Administration to the client. The Government did not take title to the farm. Sufficiency of title was determined by the attorneys of the Farm Security Administration. All relocation farms were purchased from families who wished to retire because of age or

disability, or where farms of estates were being closed. In no case was the family on the farm dislocated or inconvenienced by the purchase.

How Rehabilitation Loans Filled In

In addition to the real estate loans, funds also were loaned to make minor repairs on buildings and to purchase necessary livestock and machinery to establish an economical income-producing farm. The purchase of all livestock and machinery was made in cooperation with the project staff in accordance with standard rehabilitation loan procedure. Most of the clients had some livestock and machinery and some had a small amount of money from sale of their land, which was used as part payment on the real estate or chattels. The average price of the relocation farm was slightly under \$3,000, and the average chattel loan about \$1,000, making the total debt slightly less than \$4,000. With the proper supervision in their farming operations, there is reason to believe most of these people will succeed on their new relocation farms.

In order to take care of a few submarginal land clients who are too old or without physical capacity to care for themselves, nine "Retirement Homesteads" were constructed. All of these houses are occupied by people who represented a high medical and relief cost in their former locations. Three of the houses are completely modern and built at a cost, including land, of less than \$2,400. Six of the houses, considerably less modern, were built at a cost of but \$2,000, including land. All of the houses are well constructed and are three- and four-room cottages.

The Rent Contract With The County

Funds for the construction of the houses were furnished by the Wisconsin Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, a State agency later absorbed by the Resettlement Administration. An annual rent contract is signed by the counties affected whereby they agree to pay 3 percent of the construction cost per annum, plus necessary repairs. This provides a good, comfortable home at a cost of less than \$7 a month. On one of the units a small barn was constructed to house milk cows owned by the families. Sufficient land is furnished to provide as large a garden as is desired by each occupant. The people occupying these houses are taking excellent care of them and they all indicate contentment in their new homes.

In addition to those given financial assistance, 80 submarginal land families were assisted by the project staff in finding new locations. Farms were found for many of them on which they used the proceeds from sale of their submarginal land to make a sufficient down payment. In a few cases, credit was arranged for them to purchase a farm or a home in town. Most of this credit was in loans from local banks until such time as they received the proceeds of their land sales. More than one-half of the families had plans of their own and made their own

readjustments, although many of these families counselled with the project staff.

The project is estimated to have made possible a saving in school costs of about \$15,000 a year through enabling the closing of 12 rural schools. In addition, several thousand dollars annual expense for school transportation has been eliminated. Road costs have been reduced by the elimination of much maintenance and snow plowing expense. Relief costs have been cut materially by placing many of these families in a position to make their own living. Finally, a large group of citizens has been established in settled areas where they have a chance to obtain a reasonably good standard of living—where hope can take the place of despair.

Federal Funds for State Planning?

STATE planning is so clothed with national interest that it deserves Federal financial support, the State planning group has reported to the National Resources Committee's advisory committee.¹ At the same time it defined the proper function of State boards as the formulation of inter-related long-range programs that would lead to most beneficial use of State resources. At the same time it emphasized the need for integration of State and National planning, found that much progress had been made in public planning since 1933, and made eight additional recommendations looking toward greater activity and expansion of State planning.

These were the eight recommendations: The Federal Government, through the permanent national-planning agency, should continue to encourage State, interstate, and regional-planning efforts; major efforts should be devoted to establishment of active State boards; regional field offices should be continued; some form of interstate committee can best handle the problems that inevitably will arise from work of strong State boards; general or special consultants should serve State boards, but rigid rules for allocation of such services are unnecessary; the national-planning agency should supplement its consulting and counseling service with other forms of technical assistance; the same agency should continue to sponsor nationwide studies that do not consume too much of the State Boards' financial resources; the same agency should reappraise at intervals its relationships with State agencies.

¹ *The Future of State Planning. National Resources Committee. Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. Washington, D. C. March 1938.*

An Editor's Dream

by LYLE LINDESMITH

Mr. Hoggatt saw the country and had a vision. He saw fields of waving grain, comfortable farm homes, school houses, and laughing children, and fast-growing municipalities, with grain elevators, big stores, and energetic populations—Denver Post, August 29, 1920

THE activities of this Colorado newspaper man, following his vision, produced tangible results. Only 8 months after the Great Divide colony was founded 946 homestead entries had been made on the Government land in this portion of Moffat County, Colo., and a few hundred more had been filed. According to the Denver Post, there were 1,000 bona fide farmers in the area during the first winter of its settlement.

And, to quote this alert newspaper, "One year from today the colony expects to have not less than 3,000 bona fide farmers, with their families, residing in the district, and a flourishing town is under course of construction.

In the Post of August 29, 1920, we find the same optimistic note. We read, "The vision has become a reality, for the Great Divide colony is no longer an experiment but a wonderful success. The fields of waving grain are a reality."

A real estate man interested in the land toured the area with a group of Denver businessmen. Apparently a newspaper man was in the party, for we have the following report:

"Fields of wheat, oats, barley, and other grains were seen in all directions. The wheat heads were so heavy with grain that they have doubled over and hang low toward the ground. The kernels were large and well formed. Many of the fields had been cut and the grain is in the shock. Mr. Hoggatt never claimed that the Great Divide was a corn country, but many of the settlers planted corn nevertheless and were surprised and delighted with the result. The stalks grew well and developed large ears of corn with thick heavy rows of yellow kernels. Nowhere was there seen a field without at least a fair return to the settler. Everywhere could be seen evidences of prosperity. Instead of the long-horned cattle of a few years ago were seen sleek milch cows with heavy udders, fat calves, and still fatter hogs ready for the pork barrel.

"Many of the settlers were interviewed and all were enthusiastic over the outlook. In many fields the wheat will run 40 bushels to the acre, according to the predictions of the owners.

The Land of Promise, Eighteen Years Ago

"Not only in the matter of grain crops has the Great Divide colony proved a success, but every settler has a little vegetable garden near his home which supplies his table with not only the staples of the garden but also with luxuries. Cantaloupes and watermelons grow everywhere, as well as potatoes, squash, carrots, beets, pumpkins, lettuce, onions, and many other vegetables, and without other irrigation than that furnished by the clouds. The homesteaders have planted alfalfa with success, while others have strawberries and raspberries—crops supposed to grow only in an irrigated country."

Unfortunately, the story of this area does not end with that glowing description but we must depend upon other sources for our information. Newspapers have remained silent for several years.

This year earnest pleas have come from residents of the Great Divide area which have resulted in careful investigations by various Department of Agriculture agencies.

Officials of the local soil erosion district organized recently under the new Colorado State law wrote the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in part as follows:

"As the district was cut up into small tracts of 320 and 160 acres by homesteading, one can readily understand why the ownership pattern is quite complex and difficult to work with. The unwise land policy of the Federal Government in this district is now evident, as only 15 percent of the homesteaders are attempting to survive in this district, which was supposed to be agricultural land when it was settled. The other 85 percent of the homesteaders left the country some time ago. The addresses of many of these absentee owners are unknown.

"The average taxes for one year on a section of grazing land in the district are \$28.50 and the most revenue that can be expected from this section of grazing land is \$12.80. About 23 percent of the land is now tax delinquent. Only dry farming is practiced and it is very precarious, due to the uncertainty of precipitation. Because of the abundance of abandoned land, many nomadic bands of sheep and herds of cattle come into the district."

The Handwriting on the Wall—Rain Records

The Department of Agriculture, in investigating this area for purchase of submarginal land under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, has discovered many other interesting facts concerning this defunct bonanza.

In regard to the climate, a 44-year record indicates that the colony was doomed to failure from this factor alone. The average precipitation during this period throughout the area is from 13 to 17 inches. In 1900 less than 8 inches of precipitation was recorded. From 1900 to 1904 there were 5 consecutive years in which less than 12 inches of moisture

fell. In 12 of the 44 years recorded there was less than 12 inches. Because of the high elevation much of this precipitation occurs as snow, thus depriving the crops of moisture during the growing season and adding another handicap in that roads are blocked during about 5 months of each year.

Topography of the area did not favor the colonists. The average slope is from 8 to 10 percent. Plowing was done on hillsides, with the result that nearly all of the area has developed moderate to severe sheet erosion and many gullies have been formed.

"Wild" Land as Part of the Picture

Mention has been made of the complex ownership pattern. Less than one-fourth of the land is now owned by residents of the county. More than a fourth is owned by nonresidents and another fourth is eligible for tax deed because of chronic delinquency. The remaining one-fourth is divided among Federal, State, and corporation ownerships. A recent study made by the Colorado State land specialist shows that more than half of the privately owned land is "wild"—that is, not under controlled use.

Whether the colony ever reached the estimates of population gleaned from Mr. Hoggatt's vision has not been determined. Records show, however, that fewer than 70 farm families now reside there. Of these about 20 have reverted to the more stable production of livestock. Although a requisite of each settler was to own 3 milch cows and 3 work horses, there are now only 400 cows in the area and about 450 horses and mules. There are fewer than 200 hogs in the entire area.

Only three good houses can now be found in the area as classified by a Government field worker. More than two-thirds are in poor condition. Nearly 100 houses stand vacant and local residents admit that many houses have disappeared during the long cold winters, and those 100 vacant houses now standing and perhaps even a few of those occupied will soon cease to exist. They will no longer remain to entice the driver of the modern covered wagon as the site for the greener pastures of his dreams, for a new plan is now being made. This time the plan is based on experience rather than hope and is being prepared by many individuals rather than by one.

The New Plan and Means of Applying It

Land owners in the area have organized under the State law a soil erosion district governed by a local board of directors. This governing board, all ranchers in the area, together with other local citizens, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and other agencies, are already beginning action based on this new plan.

County commissioners have been asked and are willing to acquire under a State law all of that land chronically tax delinquent. Then they will lease such land to the board of supervisors. The supervisors are obtaining leases on certain other lands directly from private or corporation owners. Land which cannot be brought under control in this way is to be purchased by the Department of Agriculture and then leased to the board of supervisors. All of this land will then be subleased by the board for grazing use only to local residents, who will be required to follow appropriate conservation practices.

And, to bring the journalistic and land use cycles alike back to a point where a new approach and new results may be expected, the Denver Post of October 29, 1938, announced: "Designed to make possible a new livestock-feed system of agriculture, a land utilization project, embracing more than 400,000 acres, is being undertaken in northwestern Colorado."

Referring to Dr. L. C. Gray, the article continued: "Gray said that through the purchase of approximately 50,000 acres, the project will help farmers now living on farms too small for profitable operation to enlarge their units.

"The unsuitability of the soil in the area for cash-crop farming has been disastrously demonstrated, he said, and the land now consists of abandoned farms, overgrazed pasture lands, and land unsuccessfully used for crop production."



THE LAND POLICY REVIEW continues as a publication of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture recently directed by Secretary Wallace. Units of the land utilization program remaining in B. A. E. include those associated with land economics, farm population and rural life, and farm management. Those dealing with land acquisition, land development, and project organization are now directed by the Soil Conservation Service.



Here and there

★ NOW is the time of year when, apparently, all good planners meet . . . They meet most extensively this year December 28-30 at the Detroit-Leland Hotel in Detroit, where the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the American Farm Economics Association will follow the procedure of last year's twenty-eighth. . . . Most sessions have been limited to two papers and two formal discussions, in order to permit as much time as possible for discussion from the floor.

★ Leading off on opening day—and remembering the program at press time is tentative—with a discussion of the problem of farm operation under the A. A. A., the attendees will hear H. B. Rowe, of the Brookings Institution, on the effect of the A. A. A. program on regional specialization in agriculture, and P. E. Johnston, of Purdue University, on the effect of that program on the organization and operation of the individual farm. . . . B. H. Hibbard, of the University of Wisconsin, will be the chairman, and W. W. Wilcox, of Iowa State College, and R. J. Saville, of Louisiana State University, will lead the discussion.

★ Public control of land use next engages the attention of the meeting, with Under Secretary of Agriculture M. L. Wilson presiding, and M. M. Kelso, of B. A. E., and F. F. Elliott, of A. A. A., conducting discussion. . . . G. S. Wehrwein, of the University of Wisconsin, will discuss public control of land use in this country, and Karl Brandt, of Stanford, such control in Europe. . . . Rounding out the first day will be an appraisal of agricultural economics accomplishments, under chairmanship of H. C. Taylor, of the Farm Foundation. . . . C. E. Ladd, of Cornell, and H. R. Tolley, chief of B. A. E., will, respectively, discuss agricultural economics' contribution to farming and to the general welfare, and discussions will be led by H. C. M. Case, of the University of Illinois, and John D. Black, of Harvard.

★ The next day, December 29, will be dedicated, in the morning, to land use problems of the Great Plains, and, in the afternoon, to questions of public assistance to low-income farmers, in addition to two roundtables. . . . In between will be sandwiched a luncheon—a joint luncheon of the Rural Sociological and American Sociological Societies—when C. H. Hamilton, of Texas A. & M., will talk on social effects of

recent trends in mechanized farming. The Great Plains session, over which H. C. Filley, of the University of Nebraska, will preside, will include discussions by E. A. Starch, of Montana State College, regional coordinator for the Northern Great Plains, on modifications in farming types and other adjustments needed in the Plains, and by L. C. Gray, assistant chief of B. A. E., on Federal purchase and administration of land in the region. E. C. Johnson, of F. C. A., and Peter Nelson, of Oklahoma A. & M., will lead the discussion.

★ Public assistance to low-income farmers will be discussed in its relationship to northern and southern farmers by, respectively, R. C. Smith and T. Roy Reid, both of F. S. A., and in its relationship to national agricultural policy, by J. S. Davis, of Stanford. . . . I. G. Davis, of Connecticut State College, will lead the discussion, and J. I. Falconer, of Ohio State University, will be chairman.

★ One of the two round tables will deal with land problems in the Lake States, and Gladwin E. Young, of B. A. E., will be the chairman. . . . E. J. Ellingson will talk about tax reversion and the administration of tax reverted land, while R. M. Gilcreast and Sidney Henderson will deal with Minnesota and Wisconsin problems. . . . All are Department of Agriculture men. . . . F. P. Struhsaker, of the Michigan department of conservation, will consider problems in that state.

★ With W. B. Murray, of Iowa State College, presiding, the other round table will be devoted to land values. . . . These will be discussed by C. H. Hammer, of the University of Missouri, in relation to Government agricultural policy, and by L. H. Bean, of the Department of Agriculture, in relation to Government monetary policy. . . . Land values as they concern farm credit and commercial bank policy will be the topics of A. B. Lewis, of F. C. A., and A. G. Brown, of the Ohio Citizens Trust Company. . . . C. L. Stewart, of the University of Illinois, will be concerned with land value changes in European countries.

★ The following day of the meeting, December 30, will be devoted particularly to professional farm management, livestock marketing, farm price study procedures, and milk distribution costs discussions.

★ While all of this is going on, the Rural Sociological Society of America will be holding its annual meeting, also in Detroit, and talking chiefly about the rural community and social aspects of the farm labor problem. . . . J. H. Kolb will be chairman of one; C. C. Taylor of the other. . . . Papers will be read by C. W. Loomis, Douglas Ensinger, Paul H. Landis, H. C. Hoffsonmer, and R. E. Wakeley; and Dwight Sanderson, of Cornell, will discuss criteria for rural communities in his presidential address. . . . Discussion by five invited members will follow

each main session and roundtable discussions will be arranged at convenient intervals.

★ Meanwhile, the National Rural Forum already has been conducted. . . . Held under auspices of the American Country Life Association at the University of Kentucky, it heard L. H. Bean and B. L. Hummel on people on low-income farms, Lowry Nelson on farm laborers, and Rupert B. Vance and Paul V. Maris on tenants and sharecroppers, together with four speakers on people on poor lands. . . . These speakers were C. E. Brehm, N. T. Frame, F. L. McVey, and W. J. Hutchins. . . . Dr. Carl C. Taylor, of B. E. A., was chairman of the panel discussions.

★ A recent State meeting of agricultural groups—that of the committee of Kansas Farm Organizations—approved a graduated land tax, equality of taxation for agriculture, reduced governmental expenditures, and continued Government support of agricultural experimentation. . . . The committee, representing the 12 major farm groups in the State, expects to press these proposals at the next session of the legislature.

★ Minimum standards governing leases required of tenant farmers borrowing from F. S. A. rehabilitation funds require now that the leases be written, cover points customary in rental agreements in the locality, be equitable, and promise reasonably secure tenure for the borrower. . . . "The new policy," says Acting Administrator Baldwin, of F. S. A., "is expected to help relieve bad features of tenancy for thousands of families."



Books

THE SOUTH: ITS ECONOMIC-GEOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT. *A. E. Parkins.*
John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York. 1938.

Dr. Parkins, a distinguished geographer and a firm believer in the potential greatness of his region, is well equipped to write about the South. To describe the physical resources, the economic and cultural history, and the factors influencing future development of an area as large and as varied as the South, is an ambitious task, and the author's success in presenting a readable and understandable picture may be ascribed to his ability at synthesis, as well as to his evident enthusiasm for his subject.

Dr. Parkins confesses himself, at the outset, to be a geographical determinist. His approach is naturally a physical one, but his viewpoint appears to be broad enough to permit the frequent admission of non-physical factors which have influenced the development of the South.

In a book as comprehensive and as nontechnical as this the student of land use cannot expect to find much in the way of new material or even a new point of view. The principal service of the book is in its popular presentation of available data. Dr. Parkins has drawn freely on standard and official sources for much of his material. The work of Dr. O. E. Baker, for example, is the basis of his section on population.

A contrast may be drawn between a book of this type and other popular books such as Stuart Chase's *Rich Land, Poor Land*. Dr. Parkins, although convinced of the need of the South for a more intelligent use of its physical resources, is not as obviously a crusader as Chase. *The South* is not primarily a propaganda book; it is not as racily written, and therefore not as easily readable, as books of the other type, but it adheres more closely to observed and tested fact. Like *Our Natural Resources and Their Conservation*, by Parkins and J. R. Whitaker, *The South* would make an excellent text for an undergraduate course attempting to study the relation of human need to physical resources.—WM. E. BRADFORD.

AMERICAN REGIONALISM. By Howard W. Odum and Harry Estill Moore. (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938. Pp. X, 693. \$3.80.)

American Regionalism is not only the first comprehensive introduction to the study of American regions but also, in the words of its authors, a "working compendium." One of its major virtues, particularly in a pilot study of this sort, is the description of criteria employed and the efforts to define terms. Students of regionalism have been handicapped by the confusion in the use of terms, and it is to be hoped that the use of this book will help them to approach, at least, a common language.

There are three parts to the book. The first and third will be of greater interest to most readers than the second, which is a descriptive analysis of the development of concepts of regionalism in various social sciences. In part I, after two introductory chapters in which the authors define their terms and distinguish regionalism from sectionalism in such a way as to indicate their underlying social philosophy, they discuss different types of regions as determined by the employment of different criteria. Two chapters are given to "natural regions" as indicated by soil, topography, climate, and river valleys. Three culture regions are then discussed in terms of metropolitan, rural, and literary and esthetic indices. There follow two chapters on service regions, in which the indices employed are governmental and "nongovernmental" (business,

sports, etc.). The two remaining chapters of part I constitute a study of "tools for regionalism"—States, subregions, districts, and regional planning—whereby regional problems can be attacked.

In part III the authors set forth their own division of the United States into regions as determined, of course, by the purposes they would serve. They seek "major composite societal regions . . . embodying the fewest contradictions, the greatest flexibility, and the largest degree of homogeneity for all purposes of study and planning," and "for study and portraiture" (pp. 13, 433). They may properly thus avoid the sterile dispute as to *the* regions by centering the preliminary inquiry properly on the purpose which the regions are to serve. Their own purpose, as stated above, leads them to employ groups of States about which there is the most substantial clustering of factors. Students of regionalism will profit from the discussion (pp. 433-46) of this crucial point, a discussion that faces difficulties with candor and to which all future efforts at this indispensable task should be indebted.

Even so brief an indication of the method and the topics treated will convey to students of land use the relevance of this book to their inquiries and findings and hence to the problems of government with which we are all concerned. Take, for example, the problem of adjusting governmental structure to functions. Many, if not all, of the tasks of government in relation to agriculture inhere in natural regions demanding particular regional programs. Dr. Ross Calvin, in his excellent regional study *Sky Determines*, illustrates the point for the Southern Great Plains.

As more concrete studies of different regions on an intensive scale are undertaken in different centers by those familiar with their region (which is the stage into which regional studies can now most profitably enter), it will be possible to utilize the methods employed by Odum and Moore and to test their generalizations. The effort to avoid the particularistic influences of "sectionalism" by assuming that "regionalism" will be the means of an integrated nationalism which avoids centralization, on the one hand, and sectional selfishness on the other, warrants scrutiny.

Dr. Odum and his colleagues have created an outstanding "school" of regional studies at the University of North Carolina. This book, with valuable tables, charts, and maps, and uniting a widely ranging outlook with great industry, should assist in and stimulate the growth of other centers of attack, since its presentation of methods encourages cooperative research and the cumulation of findings—a feature too often missing in the social studies. In this enterprise the contributions already made by members of the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges are substantial and basic, as the excellent bibliography and notes testify. Their daily tasks, indeed, are in the nature of things an application of the regional approach for which the authors plead.—JOHN M. GAUS.

{✓ *For your attention*

- ✓ **TOWARD FARM SECURITY.** *A. G. Black. B. A. E. Misc. Publication 308, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 1938.*

As a result of their experiences of the past 15 years, efforts of farmers appear likely now to be directed toward consolidation of their recent gains, the pamphlet indicates. First of all, it appears probable, they will insist upon greater stability of prices and income than in the past. They will strive for increasing opportunities for farm operators to become farm owners. Perfection of plans that will stop speculative fluctuation of land prices also is likely to be a cardinal aim. Soundly conceived insurance against the physical risks of agricultural production again, is one of the things they will ask. Finally, a basis for cooperation will be sought to end or minimize loss of physical resources through floods, drought, erosion, or loss of fertility. The pamphlet discusses security for agriculture under the headings of stability of farm prices and incomes, physical security, security against crop losses, security for farm labor, and stability of land values.

- ✓ **AGRICULTURAL LABOR IN THE UNITED STATES, 1936-37.** *B. A. E. Bibliography 72, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. March 1938.*

This bibliography supplements and brings up to date the material in *Agricultural Economics Bibliography 64, Agricultural Labor in the United States 1915-35*. This new bibliography includes references of a general nature relating to farm labor, as well as to the agricultural ladder, employment status and outlook in agriculture, agricultural labor unions, farm labor supply and demand, its mobility, and its migration to industry.

- ✓ **IMMIGRANT SETTLEMENTS AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA.** *John P. Johansen. South Dakota Bulletin 313. Brookings, S. Dak. June 1937.*

Historical, social, and cultural aspects of immigrants into South Dakota engage this author's attention in this bulletin, which carries forward a discussion initiated by Mr. Johansen in the earlier "Immigrants and Their Children in South Dakota."

- ✓ **RANGE LANDS OF NORTHEASTERN NEVADA—THEIR PROPER AND PROFITABLE USE.** *Marion Clawson, Cruz Venstrom, and T. D. Phinney. U. S. Department of Agriculture. June 1938.*

A progress report, this document gives findings to date of a project initiated to ascertain use of public domain range lands in Nevada that will lead to the most permanent, maximum prosperity. The study is expected to make available a considerable volume of information. Use of this information, it is emphasized, will depend upon the residents of the area.

- ✓ **LARGE SCALE FARMING IN THE UNITED STATES.** *D. C. Mumford. B. A. E., U. S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, D. C. April 1938.*

The evidence presented here indicates medium-sized farms have been more successful, in general, than either large or small units, and that large-scale farming apparently has been no more successful than small operations.

✓ **OUR FARM TENANCY PROBLEM.** *H. C. M. Case and J. Ackerman. University of Illinois Publication AE-867. Urbana, Illinois. May 1938.*

These authors suggest protection for landlord and tenant and improvement of lease practices, note qualifications of good landlords and tenants, and conclude that "the improvement of tenancy should provide for the development of more profitable systems of farming, the maintenance or betterment of the soil and farm improvements, equitable distribution of receipts and expenses between tenants and landlords, and greater stability and better social conditions for agriculture in general, which, taken together, should encourage and make possible the purchase of more farms, as a result of more stable and profitable farming, by the people who operate them."

✓ **REGIONAL PLANNING. PART VI. UPPER RIO GRANDE. Vol. I—Text. Vol. II—Maps. National Resources Committee. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. February 1938.**

Sixth in the series dealing with regional planning activities and progress, the report was undertaken at request of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. The volume treats of water problems of the portion of the Rio Grande drainage area above Fort Quitman, Texas. The investigation, results of which are reported here, was undertaken preliminary to attaining an accord between Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas relative to equitable allocation and use of Rio Grande waters in future development of the upper basin. Facts were sought relative to available water supply, water uses and requirements, and possibilities of adding to available supply by storage, importation, and salvage of present loss.

✓ **MOBILITY AND FARM TENANCY.** *Land Resources Department, Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics XIV (2) 208-17. Chicago, Illinois. May 1938.*

Tenancy is a steppingstone to ownership for children of owner-farmers but not for those of tenants, these South Carolina studies indicate, together with: Tenancy offers a way upward for some groups in the higher and middle economic agricultural brackets; mobility in farming is closely associated with socio-economic status; interfarm mobility may be a bed-rock factor in limitation of the enterprise; "what the farmers of this country need is a good leasing system that will enable those who rent land to obtain greater stability, and with that a greater economic and social security."

✓ **MIGRATION OF WORKERS.** *Preliminary report of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to Sen. Res. 298 (74th Cong.). Vol. I—Summary of Findings; vol. II—Appendices. U. S. Department of Labor. Washington, D. C. 1938.*

Placing emphasis primarily upon workers who migrate across State lines, the report complies with congressional direction "... to study, survey, and investigate the social and economic needs of laborers migrating across State lines, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress and the Senate in enacting remedial legislation." Part I, considering the nature of the problem, discusses characteristics of migrants, drought refugees, seasonal migration, displaced tenants, employment and security, and annual earnings of migrants. Part II deals with social problems and relief programs. Part III, the appendices, takes up legal settlement requirements, regulations affecting school attendance, migrant agricultural laborers, and related subjects.

LAND POLICY REVIEW

Contents FOR NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1938

	Page
An Experiment in Democratic Policy-Making <i>Rainer Schickele</i>	1
Farm Management Aspects of Land Planning <i>Sherman E. Johnson</i>	6
Land of Mañana..... <i>Ralph Charles</i>	9
"All the Old Mistakes"..... <i>Frank T. Swett</i>	12
Applying a Plan for Land and People..... <i>L. G. Sorden</i>	16
An Editor's Dream..... <i>Lyle Lindesmith</i>	21
Here and There.....	25
Books.....	27
For Your Attention.....	30

The Land Policy Review is published bimonthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Subscriptions for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 5 cents single copy, 25 cents per year

